



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| APPLICATION NO. 08/811,742 | FILING DATE 03/06/97 | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ZHANG | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 0756-1641 |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|

SIXBEY FRIEDMAN LEEDOM & FERGUSON
2010 CORPORATE RIDGE
SUITE 600
MCLEAN VA 22102

MMC1/0601

| |
|-------------------------|
| EXAMINER HAWRANEK, S |
|-------------------------|

| | |
|------------------|--------------|
| ART UNIT 2823 | PAPER NUMBER |
|------------------|--------------|

DATE MAILED: 06/01/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
08/811,742

Applicant(s)
Zhang et al.

Examiner
Scott J. Hawranek

Group Art Unit
2823



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Mar 31, 2000

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 5-12, 16, 19, and 26-48 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 5-12, 16, 19, and 26-48 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____.

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Application/Control Number: 08/811,742

Art Unit: 2823

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Prosecution Application

1. The request filed on 3/31/00 for a Continued Prosecution Application (CPA) under 37 CFR 1.53(d) based on parent Application No. 08/811,742 is acceptable and a CPA has been established. An action on the CPA follows.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5-8, 11-12, 16, 19, 27-48 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oka (JP '915) in combination with Liu et al. (US '826) and in combination with Kuznetsov (Inst. Phys. Conf.) and in combination with Kumomi.

Oka discloses a method of manufacturing a semiconductor device for the formation of an active matrix type electro-optical display having a driving circuit portion and display portion comprising the steps of forming an amorphous Si layer on a glass substrate by PECVD (pg. 6, translation), selectively forming a Ni layer (pg. 14, translation) of a thickness of 100-200 Angstroms, on a-Si layer in seed regions outside the regions slated to become TFT active

Application/Control Number: 08/811,742

Art Unit: 2823

regions, such that Ni does not diffuse into said active regions by abnormal diffusion, therefore the Ni is introduced into the seed regions by solid source diffusion. Thermally heating the Ni at 450 °C (pg. 6, translation) such that the Ni catalyst would diffusion through the semiconductor film forming crystal nuclei near the interface between the metal layer and the a-si layer. (pg. 7, translation) After diffusion of the catalyst through the semiconductor film the metal layer is removed to prevent abnormal diffusion (i.e. diffusion into the active layer of the TFT as defined pg. 7 of translation). The concentration of the catalyst is in the range of 1×10^{19} to 1×10^{20} atoms/cm³. (pg. 71, col. 1). Formation of semiconductor islands (fig. 2b) consisting of a first region and the formation of a semiconductor island consisting of a second region. Examiner takes official notice that the formation of semiconductor islands is notoriously obvious in the art in order to provide device isolation.

Kuznetsov teaches that a metal catalyst induced crystallization occurs by lateral diffusion of the metal throughout the a-Si film. Thus, such a diffusion while not explicitly taught by Oka, is inherent in the process of Oka as a result the metal induced lateral crystallization. Then a-Si is thermally crystallized at 550 °C, where the grain nuclei ordinarily form in the seed regions and grain growth proceeds from said seed regions parallel to the substrate surface and TFT charge carrier flow (fig. 5-8). TFTs are subsequently formed in the crystal growth region. Oka does not explicitly anticipate leaving areas of the film amorphous.

However, Liu teaches forming regions of a-Si on Corning 7059 glass and some of the regions were not treated with Ni prior to a low temperature thermal treatment these regions

Application/Control Number: 08/811,742

Art Unit: 2823

remain amorphous. While a-Si regions which were treated with Ni are crystallized into polysilicon after said thermal treatment (Example 2). Liu teaches the selective crystallization of certain regions is advantageous because it allows simultaneous formation of driver TFTs which require a low leakage current in the amorphous regions (col. 3, lines 10-17).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the requisite art to leave a second region (disposing nickel in contact with a selected region of only the first region of the semiconductor film) of Oka amorphous by not providing a seed region. One would have been motivated in order to simultaneously obtain driver TFTs of high mobility in the polysilicon regions and pixel TFTs, which require a low leakage current in the amorphous regions and other disclosed intended purposes of Liu.

Kumomi teaches MILC or catalyst enhanced areas crystal growth takes place parallel to substrate (e.g. MILC). It is held, absent evidence to the contrary, that crystal growth of Oka would occur by this mechanism. See In re Best, 195 USPQ 428 (CCPA 1977) and In re Fitzgerald, 205 USPQ 594 (CCPA 1980).

3. Claims 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oka (JP '915), in combination with Liu et al. (US '826) and in combination with Kuznetsov (Inst. Phys. Conf.) and in combination with Kumomi as applied to claims 5-8, 11-12, 16, 19, 27-48 above, and further in view of Yonehara (US '093) and/or Shibata (US '224 or JP '224).

Application/Control Number: 08/811,742

Art Unit: 2823

Oka and Liu lack anticipation for irradiating the polysilicon after the thermal crystallization.

Yonehara and/or Shibata teach the irradiating the polysilicon after a thermal crystallization in order to improve the properties of the film, such as mobility. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to irradiate the polysilicon of Oka and Liu after the thermal crystallization in order to improve its mobility and other disclosed intended purposes as taught by Yonehara and/or Shibata.

4. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oka (JP '915) in combination with Liu et al. (US '826) and in combination with Kuznetsov (Inst. Phys. Conf.) and in combination with Kumomi as applied to claims 5-8, 11-12, 16, 19, 27-48 above and further in view of Kuznetsov.

Koznetsov teaches determining Ni concentration in metal induced crystallized silicon using SIMS (sec. 2)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the requisite art to test the metal induced crystallized silicon of Oka or catalyst containing material of Oka by SIMS to check for the presence of and to determine the distribution of deleterious metal impurities (Oka, pgs. 10-11 of translation) as taught by Kuznetsov.

Application/Control Number: 08/811,742

Art Unit: 2823

Response to Arguments

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., controlling a nickel adding amount and an adding portion in order to form a thin film having a crystallinity of desired crystal configuration at a desired portion and other catalytic effects and characteristics as recited on page seven of arguments) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

The concentration of 1×10^{19} atoms/cm³ is disclosed by Oka in the amended rejection, supra. In the case where the claimed ranges "overlap or lie inside ranges disclosed by the prior art" a prima facie case of obviousness exists. *In re Wertheim*, 541 F.2d 257, 191 USPQ 90 (CCPA 1976); *In re Woodruff*, 919 F.2d 1575, 16 USPQ2d 1934 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Abnormal diffusion is defined by Oka as recited, supra.

Application/Control Number: 08/811,742

Art Unit: 2823


Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Scott J. Hawranek whose telephone number is (703) 305-0070. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday from 8:30 to 6:00 P.M. .

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wael M. Fahmy, can be reached on (703) 308-4918. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-7722.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1778.

Scott J. Hawranek
Art Unit: 2823
June 1, 2000



Charles Bowers
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2800